

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed September 8, 2006. Claims 1-33 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-33. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

I. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang (Publication No. 2004/0167864) in view of Kozlov (Publication No. 2003/0221168 A1), and further in view of Beauchamp, *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,621,505 B1).

In the Office Action mailed 9/08/06, Examiner claimed that a newly cited reference Kozlov “teaches keeping in memory only a subset of the stream of events at any time ...”. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Kozlov stores elements into memory first, then some of the elements are removed only if certain conditions (as described in [0046]-[0048]) are met. In other words, it is quite likely that the entire document stays in memory and none of the elements is removed under certain conditions. Consequently, the memory demand will always go up to accommodate peak usage before (if ever) going down, and there must be sufficient memory to meet such demand. In contrast, the present invention only keeps a subset of the stream of events in memory at anytime without the “expand- (maybe) reduce” cycle, and thus avoids the peak usage scenario in Kozlov. Beauchamp is a data presentation method at the upstream of the data processing method of the present invention as discussed in the previous responses. Therefore, Wang in view of Kozlov and further in view of Beauchamp cannot render the present invention in independent claims 1, 13, 23, and 33 obvious. Since claims 2-12 depend on claim 1, claims 14-22 depend on claim 13, claims 24-32 depend on claim 23, Wang in view of Kozlov and further in view of Beauchamp cannot render claims 1-33 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at

least this reason, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to these claims be withdrawn.

II. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 8, 2007

By: /David T. Xue/
David T. Xue
Reg. No. 54,554

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, Fourteenth Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910